

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above-referenced application.

In the Office Action, Applicant notes with appreciation that claims 1-10 and 12-20 are allowed. Claim 11 is now rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates in view of Hirose. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 11 is directed to a non-obvious feature of the invention which allows the updating of the processing condition of an icon, i.e., to change the processing performed by that icon. The novel condition update unit, as claimed, updates an item common to a processing condition such as, by way of non-limiting example, printing on both sides of a sheet of paper for all jobs associated with a target icon, across a group of icons having that common characteristic. In this way, if the actual process to be performed by one icon is common to several icons, then the process which will be performed by the targeted icon can be updated across all similarly situated icons.

In other words, the information processing apparatus of claim 11 contains structure for updating a process common to a processing condition all together that is associated with said group of icons as affirmatively claimed. There is no teaching of such a structure in the prior art.

In the Office Action, Bates is relied upon to teach an information processing apparatus comprising the pointing device and display unit for displaying icons as well as a detection unit for detecting operation performed on the first icon when moved to the second icon. Bates is further considered to teach that the second icon includes a group of icons associated with the processing condition. As recognized in the Office Action, Bates does not teach a condition update unit for updating the processing condition, let alone for updating the processing condition across a group of icons.

Applicant wishes to point out, in addition to the shortcomings identified in the Office Action that Bates merely shows a multi-function icon that is in reality an icon

comprised of a plurality of regions, each representing a function. By way of example, a printer icon 150 includes the control region 152 and print region 154. When a data file 114 is dropped on control region 152, printer settings are set using the data file. When the data file 114 is dropped on the print region, the contents of the data file are printed. There is no teaching of the process changing in response to movement of the first icon, and no teaching of updating operation associated with both icons 152 and 154 simultaneously.

Hirose is relied upon in the Office Action as teaching the condition update unit updating the process based on the detection of the detection unit. It is further relied upon to teach that the condition update unit updates an item common to a processing condition all together that is associated with groups of icons. However, Hirose discloses that according to attribute information such as prohibition of file deletion, a plurality of second icons such as the clock and shredder icons disappear and respective dots are displayed instead in response to the beginning of dragging of the first icon. The dots are displayed to indicate that this text file cannot be processed even when the first icon is dropped on the second icon due to the attribute of the file. There is no update of the process functionality. The functionality is merely turned on or off.

For example, dropping the text icon, the shredder icon cannot allow the text file to be deleted because of the prohibition of file deletion and the clock icon does not have any function of processing of any text file. For these reasons, these disappear. This is merely a more sophisticated teaching of Bates. Where Bates teaches that different operational settings may be provided at a single icon location, Hirose merely teaches that the state in which icons are displayed may be changed from operative to inoperative as a function of the first icon characteristics. Neither of the references, either taken alone or combined, teach updating an item common to a processing condition, i.e., changing the processing condition associated with the plurality of icons all together across the group of icons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is allowable over the prior art.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the application in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). If the Examiner is unable to issue an immediate Notice of Allowance, he is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney with a view towards discussing the outstanding issues.

Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Dated: September 24, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Howard M. Gitten

Registration No.: 32,138
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, Massachusetts 02205
(954) 667-6130
Attorney for Applicant